

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 7 and 8 are independent claims. The Office Action indicates that claims 7 and 8 are allowed, and claims 2-6 are allowable but objected to for being dependent from the rejected base claim.

In view of the the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 was objected to for not being clear. The Examiner stated “it is not clear from the claim whether it is the first and second aperture pattern collectively of the common and pixel electrodes that create the multi-domain effect or whether the pixel electrode itself has another aperture pattern that in conjunction with the second aperture pattern confers the multi-domain effect” (Office Action, page 2). This objection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 clearly recites “a pixel electrode ... having a *first* aperture pattern” and “a common electrode ... having a *second* aperture pattern”. Claim 1 further recites “the first aperture pattern *and* the second aperture pattern divide the pixel region into a plurality of domains”. Thus, claim 1 is very clear that the first aperture pattern is formed at the pixel electrode and the second aperture pattern is formed at the common electrode.

Claim 1 does not recite that the second aperture pattern is formed at the pixel electrode. Claim 1 does not recite that there is an undisclosed aperture pattern formed at the pixel electrode in addition to the first aperture pattern.

Thus, it should be clear to the Examiner that it is the first aperture pattern (formed at the pixel electrode) *and* the second aperture pattern (formed at the common electrode) that divides

the pixel region into a plurality of domains. If it is not still clear to the Examiner, the Examiner is respectfully requested to review Fig. 2 and its corresponding description.

For these reasons, it is submitted that claim 1 is clear as to “whether it is the first and second aperture pattern collectively of the common and pixel electrodes that create the multi-domain effect or whether the pixel electrode itself has another aperture pattern that in conjunction with the second aperture pattern confers the multi-domain effect”, as questioned by the Examiner. Thus, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,473,142 issued to Kim, *et al.* (“Kim”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reason.

Claim 1 *clearly* recites “wherein the second aperture pattern has *a substantially straight portion arranged substantially in parallel with the first aperture pattern*”. An example of this claimed feature is shown in Fig. 2, in which the center portion 221 of the fifth aperture (formed at the common electrode) is arranged substantially parallel with the second aperture 122 (formed at the pixel electrode).

In this regard, Kim merely discloses “an electric field inducing window 43 is formed on at least one substrate between the first and second substrate” (column 4, lines 39-40). However, Kim does *not* disclose or suggest that the electric field inducing window 43 formed on the second substrate has a substantially straight portion arranged substantially in parallel with the electric field inducing window 43 formed on the first substrate. This is further evidenced by the

fact that the Examiner was *not* able to point out how and which portion of Kim discloses this claimed feature. No secondary reference has been introduced to cure the deficiency of Kim.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Kim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard T. Schachman Reg. No. 48,342, FOR
Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: March 25, 2005

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:WSC/tmk

\\COM\485844.1